

REMARKS

This response is being made pursuant to the election of species requirement mailed by the Patent Office on December 13, 2005.

ELECTION OF SPECIES

The Examiner requested an election be made between Species A (directed to dependent Claims 7 and 25) or Species B (directed to dependent claims 8 and 26).

The undersigned hereby elects Species A (dependent Claims 7 and 25). Presently, it is believed that Claims 1, 7, 9-25, and 27-33 are believed to all read on Species A. The Examiner has noted that Claims 1 and 13 are generic.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS

A minor amendment has been made to Claim 1 to correct a potential antecedent basis problem regarding the limitation "metal sheet". This is not a narrowing amendment.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

Dated: January 9, 2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/lkj